

**Minutes of the Complaints Committee Meeting
Tuesday 2 December 2025 at 10:30am
10-12 Eastcheap, London, EC3M 1AJ**

- Present**
- Lord Edward Faulks – Chair
 - Bulbul Basu
 - Sarah Baxter
 - Manuela Grayson
 - Sarah Havlin
 - Lord Carwyn Jones
 - Alastair Machray
 - George McInnes
 - Asmita Naik
 - Allan Rennie
 - Harriet Wilson
 - Ted Young
- In attendance:**
- Charlotte Dewar, Chief Executive
 - Alice Gould, Head of Complaints
 - Emily Houlston-Jones, Head of Complaints
 - Michelle Kuhler, PA & minute taker (*remote*)
- Also present: Members of the Executive:**
- Rosemary Douce
 - Tom Glover (*remote*)
 - Róisín McCann
 - Paul McGarrity
 - Marcus Pike
 - Molly Richards
 - Thomas Rothery
 - Hira Nafees Shah (*remote*)
 - Sophie Thomsett
 - Davina Wong
- Observers:**
- Jonathan Grun, Editors' Code Committee

1. Apologies for Absence and Welcomes

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, including new staff members Thomas Rothery, Operations Manager and Róisín McCann Complaints Officer.

There were no apologies received

2. Declarations of Interest

There were declarations received from Alastair Machray for item seven, and Ted Young for item eight. Both members left the meeting for the respective items.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting that was held on 14 October 2025.

4. Matters arising

There were no matters arising.

5. Update by the Chair – oral

The Chairman informed the Committee on the status of recruitment for his successor.

6. Complaints update by the Head of Complaints – oral

Emily Houlston-Jones, Head of Complaints, gave the Committee an update on complaints of note that are in the pipeline.

She also said that the Committee handbooks had been updated and were ready for circulation along with the Committee induction pack.

7. Complaint 02907-25 McCann v The Sun on Sunday

The Committee discussed the complaint and ruled that the complaint should not be upheld. **A copy of the ruling appears in Appendix A**

8. Complaint 01640-25 STAMMA v Daily Mail

The Committee discussed the complaint and ruled that the complaint should not be upheld. **A copy of the ruling appears in Appendix B**

9. Complaints not adjudicated at a Complaints Committee meeting

The Committee confirmed its formal approval of the papers listed in **Appendix C**.

12. Any other business

Complaint: 04436-25 Moshelian v The National was returned to the Committee for discussion.

The Committee discussed the complaint and ruled that the complaint should be upheld, and a correction is required. **A copy of the ruling appears in Appendix D.**

The Chief Executive spoke to the committee in relation to how IPSO handles complaints about the sex of transgender individuals.

APPENDIX A

O2907-25 McCann v The Sun on Sunday

Summary of Complaint

1. Ferne McCann complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that The Sun on Sunday breached Clause 1 (Accuracy), Clause 2 (Privacy), and Clause 9 (Reporting of crime) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article headlined "TV Ferne acid fiend gets 'steroid' jab in jail", published on 22 June 2025.

2. The article – which appeared on the front-page and continued on to pages four and five – reported that the complainant's ex-partner had allegedly received a steroid injection while serving a custodial sentence. It reported that the complainant's "acid attacker ex [...] was asked, 'Hey, bruv, what are you doing?', by a fellow prisoner – before replying: 'Injecting.' The exchange was caught on our exclusive video, showing laughing [complainant's ex-partner] apparently receiving a steroid jab in his buttock from another lag."

3. The article said that the complainant's ex-partner "had eight months added to his sentence in 2018 for smuggling in a phone which he used to call Dancing on Ice star Ferne, 34. She had been pregnant with their daughter, now aged seven, when he was jailed." It further reported that he "started dating former Towie star Ferne in 2016 but she dumped him after the acid attack. She had visited him in jail and revealed she told him: 'This is the last time you will see either of us. You have ruined our lives.'"

4. The front page included a large photograph of the complainant on holiday, with her ex-partner stood behind her. This photograph also appeared on page five.

5. The article also appeared online in substantially the same format, under the headline, "Fiends jail jab: Shocking moment Ferne McCann's acid attacker ex [...] is filmed being injected in bum with drugs in jail cell". This version of the article was published on 21 June 2025.

6. On 21 June, five hours before the online article's publication, the newspaper contacted the complainant's representation to inform it that it was going to publish the article under complaint. On 22 June, the day the print article was published, the complainant contacted the newspaper to say the story had "nothing to do" with her. The complainant said the article was deliberately misleading.

7. On 24 June, having not received a response from the newspaper, the complainant contacted it again. She outlined how she believed the newspaper had breached the Code.

8. On 10 July, the complainant complained to IPSO. She said the article breached Clause 9, as she said she had no relevance to the story: what her ex-partner had allegedly done while serving his sentence had no bearing on her. She said she had not consented to being identified in the story and she should not have been named.

9. In addition, the complainant said the article breached Clause 1. She said this was the case as the prominent front-page photograph – which was nine years old and featured her and her ex-partner together – viewed in conjunction with the headline implied wrongdoing on her part. She said this was misleading and distorted. She said both she and her ex-partner were both engaged to other people, making her ties to him less relevant. She said there was no public interest in publishing her connection to him and his alleged new crime.

10. She also said the newspaper's email of 21 June did not mention her name would appear in the headline or on the front page. She said this was misleading.

11. The complainant also said the article breached Clause 2 as she did not consent to the photograph being used in the article. She also said the article discussed her private and family life. She said it was an unjustified intrusion to repeatedly associate her with the ongoing actions of her convicted ex-partner – actions she had no knowledge of or involvement in.

12. The publication did not accept a breach of the Code. It said the complainant's relevance to her ex-partner's crime was established and that there were, in the public domain, multiple reports of court proceedings which resulted in the ex-partner's conviction. In these reports, the complainant was named and the relationship examined. To support its position, the newspaper provided links to articles on

various news sites reporting on the crime and the ex-partner's connection to the complainant.

13. The publication said the complainant had further made herself more relevant to her ex-partner's crimes and current incarceration and provided several examples. It said the complainant had published the statement offering sympathy to his victims and had spoken to Sunday People about the crime in November 2017 - which had also reported that she had visited her ex-partner in prison with her baby.

14. The publication also said that, in November 2022, an anonymous Instagram account had published voice notes recorded by the complainant from several years earlier. The publication said the voice notes referred to one of the acid attack victims as a 'bitch'. It said the complainant then made a statement in November 2022 to her 2.9 million Instagram followers, apologising to one of the victims in the case. This was followed by a further apology in 2023, on a popular morning television programme.

15. The publication said that the coverage and incidents it had outlined ensured that the complainant would remain associated with her ex-partner's crime and imprisonment. Therefore, it said, she was genuinely relevant to reporting on this topic.

16. The publication said the article was not inaccurate. It said that neither the headline nor the article implied any kind of wrongdoing. It said, read as a whole, the article was clear the complainant was not involved.

17. In regard to Clause 2, the publication said the photograph of the complainant revealed nothing private about her. It said all photographs depicting her had been published many times before by multiple media outlets.

18. The complainant said the publication had explained why she was relevant to the original crime in 2017 and she did not dispute this historical relevance. However, she said Clause 9 (i) requires that relatives or friends be "genuinely relevant to the story". She said the article under complaint related to her ex-partner's conduct in prison, rather than his original offence. She said she was not alleged to have been involved in the procurement of the steroid jab and did not comment on this specific incident. The complainant said her link to the original story did not provide the publication a "lifetime pass"

to link her to any and every future crime or misdeed allegedly committed by her ex-partner.

19. The publication said the “spirit of the Code” invoked in its preamble was particularly relevant in this instance. It said the purpose of Clause 9 (i) is to prevent friends and relatives of individuals accused of crimes being “tarred with the brush” of proven or alleged criminality, and consequently stigmatised by association. It said prevention of any unwanted association is only warranted and practicable when it does not already exist. It said the complainant and her ex-partner were “inextricably bound together” – to the extent that the details of the offence appeared the complainant’s Wikipedia page, under a headed paragraph.

20. At any rate, the publication said – in the context of reporting allegations that the ex-partner was suspected of smuggling in prohibited items in prison, it was relevant for the article to mention that “he had eight months added to his sentence in 2018 for smuggling in a phone which he used to call Dancing on Ice star Ferne”. It said this made the link to the complainant genuinely relevant. Further, it said that the complainant’s ex-partner was seen to be taking steroids in prison, which it considered less serious both reputationally and legally than the crime he was incarcerated for, and to which the complainant was already linked. It said there was no possible additional stigma attached to the complainant, where it was clear from the article that she was not accused of assisting or approving his actions in any way.

Relevant Clause Provisions

Clause 1 (Accuracy)

- i) The Press must take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted information or images, including headlines not supported by the text.
- ii) A significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distortion must be corrected, promptly and with due prominence, and – where appropriate – an apology published. In cases involving IPSO, due prominence should be as required by the regulator.
- iii) A fair opportunity to reply to significant inaccuracies should be given, when reasonably called for.
- iv) The Press, while free to editorialise and campaign, must distinguish clearly between comment, conjecture and fact.

Clause 2 (Privacy)*

- i) Everyone is entitled to respect for their private and family life, home, physical and mental health, and correspondence, including digital communications.
- ii) Editors will be expected to justify intrusions into any individual's private life without consent. In considering an individual's reasonable expectation of privacy, account will be taken of the complainant's own public disclosures of information and the extent to which the material complained about is already in the public domain or will become so.
- iii) It is unacceptable to photograph individuals, without their consent, in public or private places where there is a reasonable expectation of privacy.

Clause 9 (Reporting of Crime)*

- i) Relatives or friends of persons convicted or accused of crime should not generally be identified without their consent, unless they are genuinely relevant to the story.

Findings of the Committee

21. The Committee first considered the complainant's concerns under Clause 9. It was satisfied the complainant was identified in the article and that she could be considered a friend or relative under the terms of Clause 9 – and noted that neither party had contended that this was not the case. The Committee therefore considered the question of whether the complainant was genuinely relevant to the story.

22. The Committee considered it was clear that the complainant was relevant to the crime for which her ex partner had been convicted of – which, it noted, the complainant did not dispute. She had had published a statement which referenced victims and apologised to them for upset her comments had caused; had spoken about the offence and conviction in interviews; and had also commented that she had visited her ex-partner in prison.

23. The Committee noted that, under the terms of Clause 9, there is no time limit for when an individual is no longer relevant to a crime. The Committee understood the complainant's position that she did not consider herself to be relevant to all reporting involving her ex-partner. However, the Committee noted that the complainant had last spoken publicly about her ex-partner in 2023 – two years before the article's publication – and that the Committee must

ensure it does not interpret the terms of Clause 9 so broadly as to inhibit a newspaper's freedom to report on criminal offences. Given this, the Committee did not consider that the passage of time between the original offence and the article under complaint meant that the complainant was no longer relevant to the original offence.

24. The complainant's ex-partner was in prison due to offences he had committed, to which the complainant was genuinely relevant, for the reasons set out above. Therefore, in this instance, the Committee were of the view that the complainant genuinely relevant to the story, which reported on actions he had committed while incarcerated for the earlier acid attack and a phone smuggling offence. As such, there was no breach of Clause 9.

25. The Committee then turned to the complaint under Clause 1. It noted that the article clarified that the complainant was no longer in a relationship with her ex-partner, and the Committee did not consider that the photograph implied that the complainant was involved in his alleged activity in prison or in the earlier acid attack.

26. The Committee considered that the headline – read in isolation – was ambiguous; it could be interpreted as the complainant having been involved in the attack, or on reporting on her involvement with an individual who had perpetrated the attack. However, it noted that the article – in its first line – referred to the complainant's ex-partner as her "acid attacker ex". This clarified the nature of the previous relationship, and that their relationship had ended. In such circumstances, the Committee did not consider the headline or photograph were inaccurate, misleading or distorted, and was satisfied the headline was supported by the text of the article. There was no breach of Clause 1 on this point.

27. The complainant also said that the publication's initial email to her had been misleading – as it had not said her name would appear in the headline or front page. Clause 1 relates to the accuracy of published material, rather than concerns that pre-publication correspondence is inaccurate. The Committee also noted that newspapers are not required to set out in detail how an article might appear to the subject of the article prior to publication. While the prominence of the complainant's name had not been referenced in the email, the Committee did not consider that this had resulted in the publication of inaccurate, misleading, or distorted information. This was especially the case where there is no requirement for a right to reply in circumstances where an article does not contain

any significant inaccuracies. There was no breach of Clause 1 on this point.

28. The Committee next considered the complainant's concern – under Clause 1 – that there was no public interest in publishing her connection to her ex-partner. The Committee noted that newspapers are entitled to select which material they publish provided this does not otherwise breach the Code – the publication does not have to demonstrate a public interest in the material it publishes, unless this is to justify a potential breach of the Code.

29. The Committee also considered the complainant's concern that the photograph had been published without her consent in the article. The Committee noted that the complainant accepted that the photograph of her and her ex-partner had appeared in the public domain previously. It also had regard for the content of the photograph – the complainant was pictured with her then partner on a beach and was not seen to be doing anything typically private. For this reason, the Committee did not consider the photograph intruded into the complainant's expectation of privacy and there was no breach of Clause 2.

30. The Committee finally considered the complaint that associating the complainant with the ongoing actions of her convicted ex-partner breached Clause 2. The Committee noted that the fact of the complainant's relationship with her ex-partner – and the fact that they share a child – was clearly in the public domain, and had been referenced by the complainant herself in interviews. Given this, the Committee did not consider that this was information over which the complainant had a reasonable expectation of privacy, and there was no breach of Clause 2.

Conclusions

31. The complaint was not upheld.

Remedial action required

32. N/A

Date complaint received: 10/07/2025

Date complaint concluded by IPSO: 24/12/2025

APPENDIX B

01640-25 STAMMA v Daily Mail

Summary of Complaint

1. STAMMA complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that Daily Mail breached Clause 12 (Discrimination) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article headlined "The poohbahs were like aristocratic ladies confronted by the pong of fish", published on 8 April 2025.

2. The article appeared under the sub-headline "Westminster Sketch", and the author's name. It reported on an Environmental Audit Committee, and said:

"At a normal committee meeting, MPs would have got stuck in, scoffing that the witness were deluded. Why did this not happen? Well, this is a little difficult to discuss in the modern age but I am employed to give you a picture of proceedings, so here goes. Professor Forster had a marked stammer. We're not talking an occasional Ed Balls-style hesitation on some words. It was a full Fish Called Wanda job. Naturally one doff one's cap to a chap who battles on through such an impediment but it quite unbalanced the meeting as an exercise in democratic scrutiny. Prof Forster was jolly difficult to understand".

"This being Britain, no one mentioned it [...] Mr Richardson froze when Prof Forster was fighting with a particular consonant and then nodded in relief when it finally popped out. The MPs gazed at the floor, the walls, their computers.

Barry Gardiner (Lab, Brent W) asked some question. Prof Forster, without delay, replied: 'Absolutely.' He then embarked on a second sentence and we hit a problem. Mr Gardiner hurriedly blurted that 'absolutely' was good enough! Sammy Wilson (DUP, E Antrim) noted that clear communication was vital if climate campaigners were to persuade voters of their allegedly pressing case. Ms Pinchbeck, seamlessly: 'We recognise the need for good communication. I don't think we're necessarily the people to do that.'"

3. The article also appeared online, in substantively the same format, under the headline: "QUENTIN LETTS: The poohbahs were like aristocratic ladies confronted by the pong of fish."

4. IPSO's Regulations allow it to consider complaints from representative groups – i.e., a body or an organisation representing a group of people who have been affected by an alleged breach of the Code – where the alleged breach of the Code is significant and there is a substantial public interest in IPSO considering the complaint.

5. IPSO's Complaints Committee decided that STAMMA represented a group of people who had been affected by the alleged breach of the Code; that the alleged breach was significant; and that there was a substantial public interest in IPSO considering the complaint. The complainant also said that Professor Forster was both aware, and did not object to, the complaint being raised.

6. Having considered all these factors, IPSO informed the publication that the complaint raised a possible breach of the Editors' Code. It subsequently began an investigation into the article.

7. The complainant said that the article ridiculed and belittled Professor Forster on the basis of his stammer, in breach of Clause 12 (i). It considered the references in the article to be both prejudicial and pejorative – it stated that the article mocked the Professor, and did so to entertain. It added that it believed the article warranted an apology.

8. The complainant also questioned whether the Professor's stammer was relevant to the article, and whether the references therefore breached Clause 12 (ii). It said the article used the Professor's stammer as an excuse to mock his evidence given at the Committee, as opposed to interrogating the content of his evidence.

9. The complainant also commented that the "Fish Called Wanda" reference was "probably the most painful reference" the columnist could have chosen – it featured to a film in which an individual with a stammer is the "butt of the joke", and the viewer is invited to laugh at someone unable to speak. The complainant said that the article indicated it was preferable for individuals to stammer less – or not at all.

10. The complainant also noted that stammering is, primarily, a neurological condition which can severely impact an individuals' day to day activities – it could therefore be classed as a disability, as per the Equality Act 2010, and thus fell within the remit of Clause 12.

11. The publication apologised for any offence the article had caused. It also invited the complainant to write a letter for publication within its letters page – it said it hoped this would provide it with the chance to put its position on record. It did not, however, accept a breach of the Editors' Code.

12. It set out, firstly, that it was important to note that the article was a parliamentary sketch, which is a "unique form of satirical journalism with a long and rich heritage in newspapers across the political spectrum". It noted that the preamble to the Editors' Code references the right of newspapers to challenge, shock and be satirical. The preamble also notes the right to freedom of expression.

13. It said that the specific extracts within the article – identified by the complainant as raising a breach of Clause 12 – were intended to be humorous, in keeping with the satirical style of the column. It did not consider any references to be prejudicial or pejorative, nor, it said, were they intended to be – there was no name-calling or mean-spiritedness, or any intention to offend.

14. The publication also denied that, when read as a whole, the article was prejudicial or pejorative. Indeed, it noted that the columnist had expressed his sympathies for the difficulties Professor Forster experienced, and applauded him for his efforts.

15. The publication also denied that references to Professor Forster's stammer could be considered irrelevant, as per the terms of Clause 12 (ii). It commented that the article made the point that Professor Forster's stammer had a real impact on proceedings and, in the columnist's view, meant that the Professor was not subjected to the expected standard of scrutiny owing to a difficulty in understanding him. It also stated that, as a parliamentary sketch writer, the columnist would not be performing his task should he choose to ignore this.

16. Finally, the publication commented that it did not accept that Clause 12 was necessarily engaged – it noted that the complainant's own literature made clear that stammering is not always a disability, but depends on the individual's own perception. It said it did not believe Professor Forster had publicly described his stammer as a disability.

17. In response, the complainant maintained that the article had mocked someone's disability, and did so in a manner which was pejorative. It objected to the "tone and jokes" of the article, and particularly noted the Fish Called Wanda reference – it reiterated that "anyone who stammers would be hard-pressed to find a more humiliating portrayal of someone who stammer", given the film includes a scene where a "oddball, timid character with intense, prolonged moments of stammering is repeatedly belittled and bullied for stammering."

18. The complainant also commented that the publication's article had been written to entertain – it considered that it had punched down on someone's disability. It commented that it did not dispute the right of the columnist to say that the Professor had stammered – it objected to the article expounding on it at length. It also stated that articles such as the one under complaint contributed to a stigma toward stammering.

19. It also commented that, whether or not Professor Forster considered himself disabled was irrelevant – a stammerer fits the definition for a disability.

20. The complainant welcomed the opportunity to have a letter published; however, it did not consider that the word-count required by the publication for its letters page gave it sufficient space to set out its concerns.

Relevant Clause Provisions

Clause 12 (Discrimination)

- i) The press must avoid prejudicial or pejorative reference to an individual's, race, colour, religion, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation or to any physical or mental illness or disability.
- ii) Details of an individual's race, colour, religion, gender identity, sexual orientation, physical or mental illness or disability must be avoided unless genuinely relevant to the story.

Relevant IPSO Regulations

8. The Regulator may, but is not obliged to, consider complaints: (a) from any person who has been personally and directly affected by the alleged breach of the Editors' Code; or (b) where an alleged breach of the Editors' Code is significant and there is substantial public interest in the Regulator considering the complaint, from a

representative group affected by the alleged breach; or (c) from a third party seeking to correct a significant inaccuracy of published information. In the case of third party complaints the position of the party most closely involved should be taken into account. The Regulator may reject without further investigation complaints which show no prima facie breach of the Editors' Code and/or are without justification (such as an attempt to argue a point of opinion or to lobby) and/or vexatious and/or disproportionate.

Findings of the Committee

21. The Committee accepted the complainant's position that a stammer can have a severe impact on an individual's day to day life, and could therefore be considered to be a disability under the terms of Clause 12 of the Editors' Code

22. In making its decision under Clause 12, the Committee had regard for the Preamble to the Editors' Code. The Preamble makes clear that the Code should not be interpreted so broadly as to infringe a newspaper's right to freedom of expression, and explicitly references the right for newspapers to challenge, to be shocking, and to be satirical.

23. The Committee noted that Clause 12 (ii) does not prohibit references to an individual's disability, provided they are genuinely relevant to the story. In this instance, the article was a parliamentary sketch piece, reporting on the proceedings of the hearing in question. The Committee noted that such hearings generally revolve around oral evidence – it considered, therefore, that the fact that the Professor had a stammer was relevant to the columnist's perception of proceedings, which was what the article focused on. The Committee therefore did not consider that the reference to the Professor's stammer was irrelevant, and there was no breach of Clause 12 (ii).

24. The Committee then turned to the question of whether the references in the article were prejudicial or pejorative in breach of Clause 12 (i). The Committee again noted that the article was a parliamentary sketch piece. Such articles are generally expected to be satirical and hyperbolic and, in some circumstances, may express views which could be considered offensive. The Committee was clear that this did not mean that the terms of Clause 12 (ii) did not apply; however, it considered the context of the article to be a relevant consideration to its decision.

25. The Committee took into account the need to ensure that the terms of the Code – including Clause 12 – are not applied so stringently as to unduly limit freedom of expression, including commentary on political proceedings which may shock and offend. The Committee did not consider that the references in the article amounted to prejudicial or pejorative references to the Professor's stammer – rather, they were reflective of the writer's view, expressed in a critical and hyperbolic way, on the hearing, with details of the nature of the stammer – such as the reference to a "Fish Called Wanda" – serving the purpose of painting a picture of proceedings.

26. In such circumstances, the Committee did not consider that the references within the article to the Professor's stammer amounted to a breach of Clause 12 (i). There was no breach of the Code.

27. Notwithstanding that there had been no breach of the Code, the Committee noted that the publication had offered to publish a letter from the complainant in response to the article – although the offer had not been accepted, the complainant had appeared to welcome this. The Committee noted that, although it had not upheld the complaint, the publication was still welcome to publish such a letter.

Conclusions

28. The complaint was not upheld.

Remedial action required

N/A

Date complaint received: 09/04/2025

Date complaint concluded by IPSO: 06/01/2026

Independent Complaints Review

The complainant complained to the Independent Complaints Reviewer about the process followed by IPSO in handling this complaint. The Independent Complaints Reviewer decided that the process was not flawed and did not uphold the request for review.

APPENDIX C

Paper no.	File number	Name v publication
3427	O5708-24	Mezec v The Jersey Evening Post
3421	O1649-25	Evans v Wales on Sunday
3436	O1646-25	Stutt v Hull Daily Mail
3437	O1647-25	Stutt v mirror.co.uk
3438	O2083-25	Williams-Key v express.co.uk
3465	OO957-25	Bucknell Parish Council v oxfordmail.co.uk
3422	O1075-25	Andrews v Sunday Mirror
3449	O1072-25	Brown v The Daily Mail
	OO575-25/OO578-25/OO579-25	Gunn v Royal Borough Observer/readingchronicle.co.uk/ssloughobserver.co.uk
3434	25	
3452	O1748-25	Green v Cornwall Live
		Abrar Islamic Foundation, the Dar Alhekma Trust, and Saeed Al-Shehabi v The Jewish Chronicle
3410	O6486-24	
	O1847-25	
3426	25/O1851-25	Tice v dailyrecord.co.uk/Sunday People
3448	O2050-25	Chandler v The Daily Telegraph
3461	O2221-25	Hunt v The Daily Telegraph
3418	O1083-25	Bridgend County Borough Council v Nation.Cymru
3471	O3076-25	Williams-Key v express.co.uk
3457	O2320-25	Williams-Key v express.co.uk
3459	O2113-25	Kijko v The Daily Telegraph
3478	O2911-25	McLean v The Daily Telegraph
3481	O3158-25	Williams-Key v express.co.uk

APPENDIX D

O4436-25 Moshelian v The National

Summary of Complaint

1. Michelle Moshelian complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that The National breached Clause 1 (Accuracy) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article headlined "Trump's son joins Gaza peace talks", published on 9 October 2025.
2. The article, - which appeared in print only - was published on page 9 of the newspaper. It reported on "peace talks between Israel and Hamas", and said in its second paragraph that "the US president's son-in-law, Jared Kushner" had attended the talks.
3. The complainant said that the headline breached Clause 1 as it was not supported by the text of the article: the headline reported that Trump's son had joined the peace talks, but the text of the article referenced his son-in-law.
4. The publication did not accept that the article was inaccurate. It said that, whilst the headline referred to President Trump's son, the text made clear who was being referred to, and specified that Mr Kushner was President Trump's son-in-law.

Relevant Clause Provisions

Clause 1 (Accuracy)

- i) The Press must take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted information or images, including headlines not supported by the text.
- ii) A significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distortion must be corrected, promptly and with due prominence, and — where appropriate — an apology published. In cases involving IPSO, due prominence should be as required by the regulator.
- iii) A fair opportunity to reply to significant inaccuracies should be given, when reasonably called for.
- iv) The Press, while free to editorialise and campaign, must distinguish clearly between comment, conjecture and fact.

Findings of the Committee

5. The headline of the article referred to President Trump's son as joining the peace talks. However, this was inaccurate – it should have referred to Jared Kushner, his son-in-law. The text of the article corrected this error, however, the Committee were clear that articles should support, rather than correct, headlines. The Committee considered that referring to the wrong person in the headline of the article amounted to a failure to take care not to publish inaccurate information, and was therefore a breach of Clause 1(i).

6. The inaccuracy was present in the headline and misled readers as to the identity of which of President Trump's family members was involved in global peace talks. Given these factors, the Committee considered that this was a significant inaccuracy, which therefore required correction. No correction was offered, and there was a breach of Clause 1(ii).

Conclusions

7. The complaint was upheld under Clause 1.

Remedial action required

8. Having upheld the complaint, the Committee considered what remedial action should be required. In circumstances where the Committee establishes a breach of the Editors' Code, it can require the publication of a correction and/or an adjudication; the nature, extent and placement of which is determined by IPSO.

9. The Committee considered that the headline of the article was inaccurate, as it referred to the wrong person being involved in the peace talks. The Committee was, however, aware that the article set out the correct position. Therefore, on balance, the Committee considered that a correction was the appropriate remedy. The correction should acknowledge that the headline referred to President Trump's son and should also put the correct position on record, namely that the relevant party was Jared Kushner, President Trump's son-in-law.

10. The Committee then considered the placement of this correction.

11. As the inaccuracy had appeared on page 9, the correction should appear on page 9 or further forward, or in the publication's Corrections and Clarifications column.

12. The wording should be agreed with IPSO in advance and should make clear that it has been published following an upheld ruling by the Independent Press Standards Organisation.

Date complaint received: 09/10/2025

Date complaint concluded by IPSO: 05/01/2026